ON THE IDENTITY OF BRANDISIA SOULIEI BONATI

E. D. MERRILL

With one plate

ON EXAMINING the proofs of Dr. Li's paper on *Brandisia*, this Journal, p. 136 his correct elimination of Bonati's species as a representative of this genus was noted. At the time Li's paper was prepared it was impossible to secure special information from European centers. With the improvement in communications following the termination of hostilities it impressed me as desirable to see if the excluded Bonati species of *Brandisia* could be more definitely placed. Suspecting that the type was preserved in the Paris herbarium I appealed to Dr. H. Humbert of the Muséum d'histoire naturelle, who courteously sent me an excellent photograph of the holotype. An examination of this rather clearly indicated that the family Scrophulariaceae was not involved but that probably *Brandisia Souliei* Bonati actually belonged in the Labiatae.

Turning to Bonati's description it is evident that he did not examine the structure of the ovary, for all that he says regarding the innermost set of floral organs is "stigmate bifido, lobis brevissimis. Capsula ac semina?" Feeling that it was essential that the structure of the ovary be checked I appealed to Dr. F. Gagnepain who reëxamined the type and reported: "Je me hâte de vous informer: Que cette espèce est une Labiacée; 1° parce qu'elle a le stigmate particulier à cette famille; 2° parce que j'ai vu très nettement au moins 2 nucules sur le podogyne au fond du calice. La chose est donc jugée; ce n'est pas une Scrophularicée. Je n'ai pas eu le temps de faire de plus amples recherches et de trouver le genre de Labiacées auquel appartient cette espèce litigieuse."

On the basis of the additional information courteously supplied by Dr. Gagnepain, the conclusion was reached that the genus *Chelonopsis* Miquel (Labiatae), as currently interpreted, was represented by Bonati's species, and after a consideration of the published descriptions of the proposed species that further *Brandisia Soulici* Bonati (1909) was identical with *Chelonopsis albiflora* Pax & K. Hoffm. (1922). So convinced am I as to the specific identity of the two, one erroneously placed in the Scrophulariaceae, the other correctly in the Labiatae, that on the basis of the original descriptions and without having seen specimens representing either of the species, the Pax and Hoffman one is reduced to synonymy and the following adjustment in nomenclature is made:

Chelonopsis Souliei (Bonati) comb. nov.

Brandisia Souliei Bonati, Bull. Soc. Bot. France 56: 467. 1909.

Chelonopsis albiflora Pax & K. Hoffmann ex Limpricht in Repert. Sp. Nov. Beih. 12: 477. 1922.

The species is apparently known only from the collections on which the two descriptions were based, and all three of the cited specimens came from Batang [Pa-an], Province, Eastern Tibet [=Sikang Province, China], *Soulie 5199*, "Yargòng," collected in 1904 and *Limpricht 2221, 2230* "Bejü-Batang" and "Batang-Litang," collected in 1914, the last two numbers being the basis of *Chelonopsis albiflora* Pax & K. Hoffm. "Batang" is Pa-an, and what Soulie and Limpricht designated as eastern Tibet, at least as to the "Batang" plants, is now Sikang Province, China.

The published descriptions agree with each other closely. One of the striking characters even in *Chelonopsis*, is that most of the leaves are in whorls of threes. The three collections came from the same general region, but unless duplicates of the Limpricht collections were distributed to other centers previous to the destruction of the Berlin herbarium, perhaps the Bonati collection is the sole extant representative of the species.

Naturally a botanist studying the Labiatae as did Dunn* in his consideration of the Labiatae of China cannot be censured for having overlooked a species erroneously described some years earlier and misplaced in the system not only as to the genus but also as to the family; Dunn recognized four species of *Chelonopsis* as occurring in China. Nor can Pax and Hoffman be blamed for overlooking an ample earlier description of a species that they described as new and for the same reason. This is an excellent illustration of the fact that to describe a new species is a very simple procedure, but to place a suspected new species in its proper group and to determine whether or not a proposed species is actually "new," (i.e., previously unnamed and undescribed) is another matter.

EXPLANATION OF PLATE

PLATE I

Photograph of the holotype of *Brandisia Souliei* Bonati = *Chelonopsis Souliei* (Bonati) Merrill. Courtesy of Dr. H. Humbert, Muséum d'histoire naturelle, Paris.

ARNOLD ARBORETUM,
HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

* DUNN, S.T. A Key to the Labiatae of China. Notes Bot. Gard. Edinb. 6: 127–208. 1915.